

Priority Focus Area 2
In-Home Services Design
September 2011

In March 2011, the statewide In-Home Services Workgroup created three subcommittees to address specific tasks as part of the effort to enhance the Division's In-home Services program. The three subcommittees include the Model Selection, Assessment Selection, and In-Home/CPS subcommittees. This report includes updates on the Model and Assessment selection subcommittees. The In-Home/CPS subcommittee has been indefinitely put on hold while larger CPS projects are being addressed.

In-Home Program Selection Subcommittee

During this reporting quarter, the In-Home Model Selection Subcommittee met on July 12th and August 3rd. The subcommittee's task is to select and/or design an In-Home Services model and determine how it will be applied consistently throughout Utah's Child Welfare system using existing funding and have it ready to be implemented by December 31, 2011.

At the July 12, 2011 meeting, committee members provide individual reports regarding their assigned research projects. The committee had done extensive research to find the most effective evidence-based "model" for In-Home Services. Committee members have researched information from several national organizations such as The Child Welfare Information Gateway, National Resource Center for In-Home Services, The California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare, Casey Family Programs, and others. Information and model examples had been gathered from numerous states, districts, and counties outside of Utah and well as models tried in Utah. At that point, the committee concurs with a conclusion articulated by one of the Casey Family findings which indicates, "No one intervention, no matter how powerful or effective, is the solution to the complex and diverse problems encountered by the child welfare system." Many of the evidence-based models and promising practices in Child Welfare In-Home Services are directly targeted at specific populations and/or specific identified needs such as substance abuse or parenting.

The committee also addressed the issue of developing an in-home model as opposed to an in-home program. A "model" is defined as more of a service or treatment such as Homebuilders or Triple P Parenting. A "program" is more of a continuum or spectrum of interventions and services that can be individualized to unique family needs. Utah already has models that provide foundation to the In-Home work which are the Practice Model and Safety Model. What is lacking is some framework and practice guidelines that help drive the In-Home Services. DCFS is in the process of adopting and implementing the Structured Decision Making (SDM) program. The committee reviewed the structure and framework that the SDM will provide. The SDM contact standards grid provides structure for the amount of contact and visitation expected for

different levels of risk (very high, high, moderate, and low risk). The questions then become what do workers do during their visits and what do worker see as their role? Historically, there has not been much opportunity for in-home workers (other than family preservation workers) to be “change agents.” There is a real potential for the In-Home Services Program to provide workers with tools and options that would allow them to be change agents during their home visits rather than just monitoring compliance. What is needed to complete an In-Home Services Program is an array of service and intervention models and options, both at the caseworker and private provider level, to meet a variety of child and family needs. Committee members made the decision to change the name of the committee from the In-Home “Model” Selection Committee to the In-Home “Program” Selection Committee. The committee will now focus their efforts at developing a service and resource grid. The Practice Model foundation, the SDM, and the In-Home Services grid together will comprise the “In-Home Services Program.”

At the August 3, 2011 meeting, committee members reviewed the key elements of the In-Home Program. In-Home Services do not function independently of the other program areas but are directly connected to intake, CPS, and foster care. The Practice Model skills and principles serve as a foundation for the entire spectrum of services. The Safety Model provides an overarching umbrella to the work. The Structured Decision Making Model that is in the process of being adopted will serve as a framework and common assessment language that will span the entire spectrum from intake through in-home or reunification. Committee members reviewed the draft In-Home Program grid and the role it will play in the spectrum of services. Discussed how the subcommittee had met the original Project Objective Statement. Discussed disbanding the subcommittee as successfully completed. The decision was to present results to the In-Home Workgroup on August 9th to see if the sponsor has any additional requests for the subcommittee at this point.

In-Home Assessment Selection Subcommittee

During this reporting quarter, the In-Home Model Selection Subcommittee met on July 13th and July 20th. The subcommittee’s task was to choose one of the three assessment tools being reviewed (CANS, SDM in-home assessment, and NCFAS) and determine when and how it will be used and how it will be implemented across the state using existing funding and have it ready to be implemented by September 31, 2011.

At the July 6, 2011 meeting, guest Presenter, Shannon Flasch from the Children’s Research Center, provided a Webinar presentation on the SDM Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA). The purpose of the Webinar was to provide committee members with as much current information as available regarding the FSNA assessment and address committee member’s questions. Committee members also spent time expanding and refining the definitions of the qualities that would be used to compare and contrast the three assessments being reviewed. Before the next committee meeting, members were then to individually rate each of the qualities for each of the three assessments.

At the July 20, 2011 meeting, committee members reviewed individual committee members scoring and ranking of the three assessments based on the previously set criteria. Results from the individual rankings yielded the same results in overall outcomes. There were no significant discrepancies between committee members' scoring in the pattern of the scoring of the qualities as well as the overall scores. It is interesting to note that committee members come from various job functions including one non-DCFS participant yet there was pronounced consensus in the scoring outcome. All committee members' outcomes resulted in the following ranking for which assessment would be meet the needs of the In-Home Services program. The FSNA was ranked #1, CANS ranked as #2, and NCFAS as #3. Committee members reviewed each of the qualities that were rated to provide supporting rationale for their recommendation. Committee will recommend to the In-Home Workgroup that the SDM Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA) be adopted as the In-Home Services Assessment. Committee members consider their project as completed. Barring any special follow-up requests from the In-Home Workgroup, the In-Home Services Assessment Selection Committee will now be disbanded.

In-Home Services Workgroup

During this quarter, the statewide In-Home Services Workgroup met on August, 9, 2011. Participants included Region Directors, state office administrators, and program and practice improvement staff. The committee was provided updated reports the two subcommittees: Model Selection and Assessment Selection. Minutes from each subcommittee meetings provide a detailed account of the decision-making progress and the recommendations. In summary, the Model Selection subcommittee recommended that the In-Home Program consist of a foundation of Practice Model, the overarching Safety Model, the framework provided by Structured Decision Making (SDM), with a Grid of In-Home interventions based on SDM level and need/service intensity level. The Assessment Selection subcommittee updated included discussion regarding the assessment evaluation process. The rating criteria, scoring, and selection rationale were also reviewed. The subcommittee had unanimously agreed on the decision to recommend the SDM Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA) as the assessment for In-Home Services. The workgroup accepted the subcommittee's recommendation to adopt the FSNA. Both of the subcommittees were viewed as having successfully completed their project objectives. Both subcommittees were disbanded. Opportunities to participate in the next phases of the project will be offered to interested program selection subcommittee members.

The Workgroup discussed and planned the next three phases of the In-Home Services Program development:

Phase I

1. Preliminary work on the Grid headers. Review all of the CPS contributing factors and allegation types to help ensure each could be addressed in one of the column headers.

2. Incorporate the Region In-Home Program Specialists into the Grid header development.
3. Identify and select an oversight group that would oversee the In-Home Grid development. The group would identify content experts for each service/intervention column on the Grid. Suggested members for the oversight group include:
 - State contract team
 - Interested members of the Program Selection subcommittee
 - PPIT (Program and Practice Improvement Team)
 - Guardian ad Litem
 - Assistant Attorney General

Phase II

1. Complete the Grid headers for services/interventions.
Deliverable: Finalized Grid headers.
Completion schedule: Mid-September 2011
2. Use small groups of content experts to fill in the Grid by identifying what services would be appropriate for each SDM level for each specific need/intervention column.
Deliverable: Finalized Grid content for each need/intervention for each SDM level.
Completion schedule: January 2012
3. Resources. Identify specific resources currently available in each region for the Grid needs/interventions. Input will be sought from:
 - Caseworkers
 - Parents who have participated with In-Home services
 - DCFS region contract managers
 - DCFS finance- state office
4. SAFE change proposals.
5. Caseworker guide/interventions (i.e. what they do during home visits)

Phase III

1. Updating Practice Guidelines
2. Training development
3. Marketing